UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/582,788 | 06/13/2006 | Hitoshi Ono | Q95452 | 5946 |
| 23373 7590 04/21/2011 EXAMINER SUGHRUE MION, PLLC | | | | |
| 2100 PENNSY | LVÁNIA AVENUE, N | GOFF II, JOHN L | | |
| SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1746 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/21/2011 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/582,788 | ONO ET AL. | | | |
| Examiner-lintiated interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | JOHN L. GOFF II | 1746 | | | |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: <u>Uno</u> | der Final Rejectio | <u>on</u> | | |
| (1) <u>JOHN L. GOFF</u> . | (3) | | | | |
| (2) <u>Bruce Kramer</u> . | (4) | | | | |
| Date of Interview: <u>14 April 2011</u> | Time: | | | | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | | | | |
| Part I. | | | | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: None | | | | | |
| Claims discussed: All | | | | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: None | | | | | |
| Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet | | | | | |
| Part III. | | | | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary | examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the interview, since | ne substance | | |
| /John L. Goff/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1746 | | | | | |
| (A | pplicant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if a | appropriate) | | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants representative asked for clarification regarding why box 3(b) regarding the issue of new matter was checked on the PTOL-303 mailed 4/8/11. Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment that was not entered to insert dependent claim 15 into independent claim 14 MAY introduce a new matter issue regarding claim 16 in its dependency on claim 15 as amended, i.e. without further review of applicants specification it is not clear that a process including three liquid treatments is disclosed. The explanation above was inadvertently omitted in the advisory action mailed 4/8/11.